

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed June 24, 2009. In the instant amendment, claims 1, 9-13, 15-18, 21, 24, and 30 have been amended.
2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-27, and 29-38 have been examined, and all remained pending claims are allowed (renumbered 1-34).

Examiner's Amendments

3. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
4. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Greeley, Registration No. 31,019, on Oct 20, 2009, to obviate any potential 35 USC 101 issue and put the claims in condition for allowance.

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1 is amended as follows:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended),

In line 1, after "A method", insert - -, executed by a processor,- -.

Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

5. As Applicants pointed out in the Remarks, the prior art of record (Van Huben) do not disclose and/or fairly suggest at least claimed limitations recited in such manners in independent claim 18 *"A computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method for qualifying a control strategy for a process control system comprising: receiving from a user a plurality of user-defined qualification states and a plurality of user-defined state transitions between the plurality of user-defined qualification states of a life cycle process; processing an addition of a new user-defined qualification state to said a plurality of user-defined qualification states by: receiving a definition of said new user-defined qualification state from a user, said definition including a name and a fallback user-defined qualification state, wherein said fallback user-defined qualification state is a life cycle stage of a qualification process, and wherein said new user-defined qualification state comprises an attribute of whether said control strategy is loadable to a controller of said process control system..."* and similarly recited in such manners in other independent claims 21 and 24 (Remarks, pp. 13-14).

As Applicants further pointed out in the Remarks, the prior art of record (Kauffman, Dardinski, and Van Huben) do not disclose and/or fairly suggest at least claimed limitations recited in such manners in independent claim 1 *"A method for enforcing a life cycle process in a source control system, comprising: providing a check-in function to check-in at least one object of a control strategy for a process control system to said source control system; providing a check-out function to check said object out of said source control system; receiving from a user a plurality of user-defined qualification states and a plurality of user-defined state transitions between the plurality of user defined qualification states of said life cycle process; performing said life cycle process on said object of a control strategy for a process control system by subjecting said object when checked out to said plurality of user-defined qualification states, each user-defined qualification state having attributes..."* and similarly recited in such manners in other independent claim 26 (Remarks, pp. 14-18).

As Applicants further pointed out in the Remarks, the prior art of record (Kauffman, Murthy, and Van Huben) do not disclose and/or fairly suggest at least claimed limitations recited in such manners in independent claim 13 *"A computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method of qualifying an object of a control strategy for a process control system pursuant to a life cycle process, said method comprising receiving from a user a plurality of user-defined qualification states and a plurality of user-defined state transitions between the plurality of user-defined qualification states of a life cycle process; performing said life cycle process on said object of a control strategy for a process control system by subjecting said object to said plurality of user-defined qualification states; validating a user defined state transition from a current user-defined qualification state to a next user-defined qualification state of a-said plurality of user-defined qualification states by: determining whether said next user-defined qualification state in a state transition request from a user is allowed from said current user-defined qualification state in said user-defined state transition request based on said user-defined transition restrictions..."* and similarly recited in such manners in other independent claim 15 (Remarks, pp. 19-20).

As Applicants further pointed out in the Remarks, the prior art of record (Kauffman and Van Huben) do not disclose and/or fairly suggest at least claimed limitations recited in such manners in independent claim 11 *"A computer, readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method in a life cycle process of determining permissions for actions with an object of a control strategy for a process control system based on a user defined state of said object, said method comprising: receiving from said user a plurality of definitions of a plurality of user-defined qualification states and a plurality of user-defined state transitions between the plurality of user-defined qualification states of said life cycle process; performing said life cycle process on said object of a control strategy for a process control system by subjecting said object to said plurality of user-defined qualification states; receiving a request to perform one of said actions with said object; determining whether said object has ever been checked-in to a source control system; determining whether said object is currently checked-in; retrieving from said plurality of definitions a definition of said*

user-defined qualification state of said object that corresponds to said action..." and similarly recited in such manners in other independent claim 12 (Remarks, pp. 20-22).

These claimed limitations are not present in the prior art of record and would not have been obvious, thus all pending claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-27, and 29-38 are allowed.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy (Twee) Dao, whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Twee Dao/
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192